IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE

OF BOMBAY AT PORVORIM, GOA

Writ Petition No. /2025

Mr. Govind Shirodkar ....PETITIONER

vs.

The Goa Tourism Development Corporation & Ors ...RESPONDENTS

INDEX

SR. NO.	CONTENTS	PG. NO.
1.	Memo of Petition	1 – 10
2.	Verification and affidavit	11 - 12
3.	**Annexure 1 Colly:** Photographs of the site of construction of the 'Unity Mall' project, Chimbel, Goa, dt. 22.12.2025 and 24.12.2025	13 - 16
4.	**Annexure 2 Colly:** Relevant orders passed by various authorities and Courts; more particularly listed hereunder: i. Stop work notice issued by the V.P. Chimbel, dt. 01.10.2025	17 – 75 *17*

	ii. Order of the V.P. Chimbel, rejecting the R.1's application for a Construction License	**18 – 20**
	iii. Roznama order of the L.D. B.D.O. and the final judgement passed, dt. 27.11.2025/28.11.2025	**21 – 40**
	iv. Orders of this Hon'ble Court in W.P. 3112/2025 [F], dt. 28.11.2025; 01.12.2025 and 04.12.2025	**41 – 46**
	v. Roznama order of the L.D. D.D.P. and the final judgement passed, dt. 04.12.2025/05.12.2025	**47 – 64**
	vi. Orders of the Ld. P.D.J. Merces, Goa, in C.R.V.A. 89/2025, dt. 06.12.2025	**65 – 69**
	vii. Construction License issued by the R.2 V.P. Chimbel, dt. 06.12.2025	**70 – 73**
	viii. Roznama Order of the Ld. P.D.J. Merces, Goa, in C.R.V.A. 89/2025, dt. 17.12.2025	**74 - 75**
5.	**Vakalatnama**	

Place:
Date:

ADVOCATE FOR THE PETITIONER

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE

OF BOMBAY AT PORVORIM, GOA

Writ Petition No. /2025

IN THE MATTER OF ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

AND

IN THE MATTER OF CONSTRUCTION WORK BEING CARRIED OUT FOR THE 'UNITY MALL' PROJECT AT CHIMBEL, GOA

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE STAY ORDER DATED 06.12.2025 PASSED BY THE LD. PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE, MERCES

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE ORDER DATED 27.11.2025 PRONOUNCED BY THE BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICER, TISWADI BLOCK, AT PANAJI – GOA, WITHOUT JURISDICTION

MR. GOVIND SHIRODKAR,
Son of Late Mr. Tukaram Shirodkar,
Aged 62 years, Indian National, R/o
H. No. 133, Gaulem Bhat, Chimbel – Goa.
Email id: dacgovind@gmail.com
Contact: 9850556279 ……**PETITIONER**

v/s

1. **GOA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORP. LTD.**
through its Managing Director,
Paryatan Bhavan, 3rd Floor,
Patto, Panaji, Goa – 403001

2. **THE VILLAGE PANCHAYAT OF CHIMBEL**,
through its Secretary, 934, NH – 4A, Ilhas,
Ribandar, Chimbel, Goa - 403006.

….**RESPONDENTS**

(Above addresses are registered addresses of parties)

To,

THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE AND HIS COMPANION JUDGES, BOMBAY HIGH COURT AT PORVORIM, GOA

THIS HUMBLE PETITION OF THE PETITIONER MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWS AS UNDER

The Petitioner states and submit as under:

1. The present writ petition is being urgently filed for the purpose of seeking a stay on all development and construction activities of a project known as "*Unity Mall*", on Survey No. 40/1 of Village Chimbel, by the Respondent No. 1, Goa Tourism Development Corporation Ltd, until the stay order dt. 06.12.2025 pronounced by the Ld. Principal District Judge at Merces, Goa, is vacated and/or the matter no. CRVA/89/2025 pending before the Hon'ble District Judge, at Merces – Goa, is heard and disposed of.

2. In a nutshell, the grievance of the petitioner is that the Construction License issued by the V.P. of Chimbel on 06.12.2025, is in execution of the order of the B.D.O. dt. 27.11.2025, which has already been stayed by an interim order of the Ld. P.D.J. dt. 06.12.2025. The petitioner has filed an Application before the District Court, seeking to impugn the C.L., and in terms of the P.D.J.'s order dt. 17.12.2025, the matter has been fixed for Reply and arguments on 8th January 2026.

3. In the meanwhile, construction activities have been commenced at the site by the Resp. No. 1 on 22nd December 2025, despite the stay order [*Photos annexed at* ***Ann. 1 Colly***]. The petitioner is aggrieved as the carrying out of such activities prior to the next scheduled date of hearing of the matter on 08.01.2026 is in violation of the Court's stay order dt. 06.12.2025. Hence the urgency.

4. The brief facts relevant to this matter are summarized in the table hereunder:

Sr. No.	Date	Particulars	Pg. No.
1.	22.09.2025	G.T.D.C. commences work on 'Unity Mall' project, without obtaining a Construction License from the V.P. The Petitioner objects.	
2.	**01.10.2025**	V.P. issues Stop Work Order/Notice	**17**
3.	06.10.2025	G.T.D.C. files application for C.L.	
4.	**16.10.2025**	V.P. issues order rejecting application for C.L.	**18**
5.	30.10.2025	Aggrieved by rejection, GTDC prefers Appeal before the Ld. B.D.O. Tiswadi, under S.201-A of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994.	
6.	21.11.2025	Petitioners intervention application allowed	
7.	**27.11.2025**	B.D.O. pronounces order - Allows the appeal, directs V.P. to issue the Construction License within 24 hours.	**22**
8.	**28.11.2025**	Petitioner moves Hon'ble H.C. against B.D.O order in W.P. 3112/2025 [F]. H.C. defers operative portion of the B.D.O. order till 01.12.2025.	**43**
9.	28.11.2025 at 5:15 pm	Certified copy of the written judgement provided by the Ld. BDO to parties	**27**
10.	**01.12.2025**	H.C. hears arguments in W.P. 3112/2025 [F]. H.C. defers operative portion of the B.D.O. order till 04.12.2025	**44**

Sr. No.	Date	Particulars	Pg. No.
11.	02.12.2025	Resp. No. 2 V.P. files Revision before D.D.P. against B.D.O. Order. Notice is issued and the matter fixed for 04.12.2025	
12.	**04.12.2025**	As the D.D.P. was seized of the challenge to the B.D.O. order, the Applicant withdrew its petition in the H.C. to file its own Revision before the D.D.P. Consequently, interim order of the H.C. gets vacated/ceases to operate. Petitioner files its own Revision before the D.D.P.	**45**
13.	04.12.2025	D.D.P. stays operation of the B.D.O. order till 05.12.2025. Hears arguments at length and reserves judgment on the same day.	**47**
14.	**05.12.2025**	Judgment pronounced by the D.D.P., dismissing both Revisions and refusing a stay, at around 12:10 pm. Certified copy of the written judgment made available at 1:40 pm.	**52**
15.	05.12.2025	On the same day, Petitioner files Civil Revision Application No. 89/2025 against the order of the D.D.P, under S. 201-B of the Goa P.R. Act	
16.	**06.12.2025**	The Hon'ble Principal District Judge took up an urgent hearing on 06.12.2025 (morning half), and was pleased to grant ad – interim relief staying the execution and operation of the Order dated 05.12.2025 passed by the Dy. Director of Panchayats and consequently the Order of the B.D.O passed on 28.11.2025.	**65**

Sr. No.	Date	Particulars	Pg. No.
17.	**06.12.2025**	V.P. Secretary, purportedly in exercise of powers under S. 47-B of the Goa P.R. Act, issues Construction License for the Unity mall project	**70**
18.	**06.12.2025**	On the very same evening of 06.12.2025 at 7:00 pm, the Advocate for the Respondent No. 1 placed the Construction License issued on 06.12.2025 before the Hon'ble Principal District Judge, which was taken on record	**68**
19.	17.12.2025	On the next date of hearing i.e. 17.12.2025, the Petitioner files an application for amendment of the Revision Application, seeking to impugn the Construction License, *inter alia* as the same has been issued in execution of the very same order of the B.D.O. dt. 27.11.2025 which has been stayed by the P.D.J. on 06.12.2025. Case adjourned for reply and arguments of Respondents to **08th January 2026**	**74**
20.	**22.12.2025** till date	G.T.D.C. commences construction work at the project site, using JCBs for excavation of earth/ground and other activities. Tree felling activity undertaken on 24th and 25th December. Work is going on in full swing.	**13**
21.	29.12.2025	Present petition filed	

5. The petitioner states that that all of the relevant and important orders, documents et al. referred to above, passed by the V.P., this Hon'ble Court, and other authorities, are enclosed herewith as **Annexure 2 Colly.**

6. In the pending Revision Application, the orders of the L.D. Deputy Director of Panchayat and the L.D. B.DO. have been impugned *inter alia* on the grounds that the said orders are passed wholly without jurisdiction, and that there is non-application of mind on the substantive issues which were raised before the authorities.

7. In the amendment Application which is also pending before the P.D.J., and is scheduled to be considered on 08th Jan. 2026 by the District Court, the petitioner has sought leave to Amend the Revision and impugn the Construction License dt. 06.12.2025 for the said project, as it is explicitly issued in execution of the impugned orders of the D.D.P. and B.D.O, and if the Hon'ble District Court ultimately arrives at a conclusion that the Judgment and Orders dated 27/28.11.2025 and 05.12.2025 are without jurisdiction and/or suffer from the aforesaid infirmities, shortcomings and lacunae, any actions taken in execution of and as a consequence of the orders dt. 27/28.11.2025 and 05.12.2025 would necessarily fall and become unsustainable in law.

8. However, prior to the Amendment Application being considered on 08.01.2026, the Resp. No. 1 has already commenced developmental activities in the teeth of the stay order passed by the Ld. District Court. It is submitted that such an act by the G.T.D.C. is both in the nature of violating the Court's stay order dt. 06.12.2025, as well as an attempt to frustrate/pre-empt the Amendment application being considered on 08.01.2026, which conduct and actions are impermissible in law. If this course of action is allowed to continue without any stay, the statutory Revision proceedings filed by the Petitioner would become infructuous.

9. For all these reasons, the petitioner submits that immediate directions are required from this Hon'ble Court in order to ensure a *status quo* at the project site, pending the Revision proceedings coming up for consideration before the Ld. District Court on 08.01.2026.

10. I state that the Petitioner has not filed any other Petition in this Hon'ble High Court and/or any other Court including the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in respect of the subject matter of the present Petition. In the present circumstances, the Petitioner is constrained to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court, as the Petitioner has no other alternative, effective, expeditious, or efficacious remedy available in law.

11. The Petitioner has affixed the Court Fees of Rs.250/- (Rupees Two Fifty Only).

12. The cause of action has arisen within the jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court and therefore, this Hon'ble Court has the jurisdiction to entertain and decide the present Petition.

PRAYERS

13. In the above facts and circumstances and in the interest of justice, the Petitioner humbly approaches this Hon'ble Court for the following reliefs:

A. For an appropriate Writ, Order, or Direction, directing the Resp. No. 1, i.e., Goa Tourism Development Corporation Ltd., not to proceed with the 'Unity Mall' project; pending the disposal of C.R.V.A. 89/2025 before the Ld. Principal District Judge, Merces;

INTERIM RELIEFS:

B. For an order directing the Resp. No. 1, i.e., Goa Tourism Development Corporation Ltd., to immediately stay all construction activities including excavation work, tree felling etc. on Survey No. 40/1 of Village Chimbel, Goa; and maintain *status quo* as it exists on date;

C. For ad-interim, ex-parte reliefs in terms of Prayer clause 'B' above;

14. The Petitioner states that the Petitioner is not in receipt of any caveat.

For the above, the Petitioner is very grateful.

PLACE: Porvorim – Goa

DATE: 29.12.2025 PETITIONER

VERIFICATION

I, Mr. Govind Shirodkar, son of Late Mr. Tukaram Shirodkar, aged 62 years, Indian National, Chairperson of the Chimbel Biodiversity Management Committee, the Chairperson of the Lake Management Committee of Toyaar Lake, and the member of the Gram Sabha of the Village Panchayat of Chimbel, resident of H. No. 133, Gaulem Bhat, Chimbel, do hereby verify that paragraphs 1 (p) to 14(p) are true to my personal knowledge and beliefs, based on official documents and records; and that paragraphs 1 (p) to 14(p) are partly in the nature of legal submissions which I believe to be true.

Solemnly verified at Porvorim, Goa

on this 29th day of December, 2025.

DEPONENT

Identified by me:

Advocate for the Petitioner

IN THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY AT PORVORIM, GOA

Writ Petition No. /2025

MR. GOVIND SHIRODKAR **….Petitioner**

V/s

GOA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORP. LTD. & ANR. **…Respondents**

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITION

I, Mr. Govind Shirodkar, son of Late Mr. Tukaram Shirodkar, aged 62 years, Indian National, Chairperson of the Chimbel Biodiversity Management Committee, the Chairperson of the Lake Management Committee of Toyaar Lake, and the member of the Gram Sabha of the Village Panchayat of Chimbel, resident of H. No. 133, Gaulem Bhat, Chimbel, the Petitioner above named, do solemnly state on oath as under:

1. I say that I have today filed a Writ Petition for the reliefs sought therein, which has been drafted on my instructions.

2. I say that the annexures to the accompanying petition are the true copies of its originals.

3. That the contents of paragraphs 1 - 14 of the accompanying petition are correct and are true to the best of my knowledge and partly in the nature of information collected by me from official records; the Departments of Government and official websites/internet which I believe to be true, and partly in the nature of submissions made on legal advice which I believe to be true and correct. No part of it is false and nothing material has been concealed therefrom, and the annexures enclosed are true and correct copies of their respective originals.

Solemnly affirmed at Porvorim, Goa,
this the 29th day of December, 2025

Deponent

Identified by me:

Adv. For the Petitioner

Photograph of the Display Board at the site of the
Unity Mall project at Chimbel, Goa, dt. 22.12.2025

ANNEXURE 1 COLLY

Photograph of JCB at the site of the Unity Mall project at Chimbel, Goa, dt. 22.12.2025. Excavation works commenced on 22.12.2025.

Photograph of JCB at the site of the Unity Mall project at Chimbel, Goa, dt. 24.12.2025.
Excavation works and broken ground visible.

Photograph of trees felled at the site of the Unity Mall project at Chimbel, Goa, dt. 24.12.2025.

ANNEXURE 2 COLLY

OFFICE OF THE VILLAGE PANCHAYAT
CHIMBEL TISWADI - GOA.
☎ : 2449790

Ref.No.VP/CHIM/2025-2026/1582 Date:- 01/10/2025

Stop Notice Cum Order Under Section 66 of Goa Panchayat Raj Act 1994

Whereas this Office of Village Panchayat of Chimbel is in receipt of Complaint from Shri. Govind Shirodkar, Chairman BMC, V.P.Chimbel, for illegal development activities in Survey No.40/1 of Village Chimbel, was placed before the fortnightly meeting held on 29/09/2025 Vide Res.No.10/6 and upon discussion it is unanimously resolved to stop the work of illegal activities and submit/provide valid documents for further needful action.

Therefore I the undersigned, Sarpanch of Village Panchayat Chimbel do hereby direct you to stop the work of illegal development activities in Survey No.40/1 of Village Chimbel with an immediate effect on the receipt of this notice, and to submit/provide valid documents such as permissions/license, plans and other property documents for further needful action, failing which further necessary action will be initiated against you as per Goa Panchayat Raj Act 1994.

Given under my hand seal of this office on this day of 01 October of 2025

Santesh A Shirodkar
Sarpanch
V.P Chimbel Goa

Village Panchayat Chimbel Tiswadi

To,
Shri. Executive Engineer (Civil)
Goa Tourism Development Cooperation Ltd.
Paryatanbhavan,
Patto Panaji – Goa.

SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLE Project Cell Panaji-Goa

Copy to:-
1.Shri Govind Shirodkar,
Chairman BMC

Govind 03/10/2025

OFFICE OF THE VILLAGE PANCHAYAT
CHIMBEL TISWADI - GOA.
☎ : 2449790

Ref.No.VP/CHIM/2025-2026/1677 Date:- 16/10/2025

The Executive Engineer (Civil),
GTDC limited Paryatan bhavan, Patto,
Panaji- Goa. Project cell

Sub: Regarding objection for the proposed construction of unity mall at land bearing Sy.No. 40/1 of Chimbel Village.
Ref. no.: Your application no. W-449/PC/SPV(GTDC)/2025-26/1131 dt. 06/10/2025

Sir,

With reference to the above cited subject and letter, your above said application and file regarding issue of construction license for proposed construction of unity mall-Goa at chimbel, Panaji Goa, a scheme under the special assistance to the state for capital investment by govt of india for promotion of skill India, make in India and one district one product in property survey no. 40/1 of chimbel village, in tiswadi taluka was placed in the fortnightly meeting dated 16/10/2025 and as per vide Res. No. 3/1 it was unanimously resolved not to issue the said permission and reject the said proposal on the basis of enclosed resolution.

So, therefore your above said application/file is rejected by the panchayat body.

Thanking You

Yours Faithfully,

Sarpanch
V. P. Chimbel, Tiswadi-Goa
Encl: as above

Village Panchyat Chimbel
Tiswadi - Goa

Secretary
V. P. Chimbel, Tiswadi - Goa

SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLE (GTDC)
Project Cell
Panaji-Goa

OFFICE OF THE VILLAGE PANCHAYAT
CHIMBEL TISWADI - GOA.

Tel. 2449790

Ref.No.VP/CHIM/2025-2026/ Date:-

TRANSCRIBED HEREIN BELOW THE RESOLUTION OF THE FORTNIGHT MEETING HELD ON 16/10/2025 VIDE RESOLUTION NO 3(1)

Proposed: - Shri. Sandesh Shirodkar
Seconded: - 1. Shri. Ravindra Chopdencar
2. All present Members.

Res.No 3(1) Regarding issue of construction License for proposed Unity Mall in property Sy.No. 40/1 of Village Chimbel.

Res. No.3(1) The application along with file received from Executive Engineer (Civil) Project cell department of tourism, Goa Tourism Development Corporation (GTDC), regarding issue of construction license for proposed construction of unity mall-Goa at chimbel, Panaji goa, a scheme under the special assistance to the state for capital investment by govt of India for promotion of skill India, make in India and one district one product in property survey no. 40/1 of Chimbel village, in Tiswadi Taluka along with Technical Clearance Order from Office of the Town & Country Planning Department, ref. no. TIS/11091/CHI/TCP/2025/2026, Dated 21/08/2025, structural liability certificate, certificate of conformity with regulations, BOQ, summary sheet, Xerox copy of Form 1 & XIV, survey plan, affidavits and other approved plans is placed before Panchayat body and upon discussion and verifying the documents in the file, members present noted and found that the following documents/NOC's/permissions has not been submitted along with the application.

1. Latest I & XIV form in original.
2. Notorized copy of valid ownership documents i.e. Deed of Sale, conveyance for sale, Gift deed etc.
3. No Objection Certificate from Health Department.
4. No Objection Certificate from Directorate of Fire and Emergency Services.
5. Latest Survey Plan copy in original.
6. Approved Plan proposed for STP and Garbage Treatment Plant.
7. Consent of Establishment for STP from Pollution Control Board.
8. No Objection Certificate or Necessary permission from Water Resources Department.
9. Environment Clearance from Director of Environment and member secretary, Patto Panaji Goa.
10. Valid Conversion Sanad for commercial purpose under LRC as the recommendation is for the construction of Unity Mall which is a commercial use.
11. No objection certificate for the tree cutting from competent authority.

So, it is unanimously resolved by the members present to reply that they have not furnished all the required documents and also to resolved that the proposed unity mall has been issued 200 FAR, which will put immense pressure on the limited natural

OFFICE OF THE VILLAGE PANCHAYAT
CHIMBEL TISWADI - GOA.
☎: 2449790

Ref.No.VP/CHIM/2025-2026/ Date:-

resources and infrastructure of the village, the said project will severely affect the existing water supply, electricity and drainage systems which are already inadequate for current residents and general public and also will destroy toyyar lake. So therefore by taking into consideration of all the difficulties and grams sabha resolution adopted by the gram sabha members to oppose unity mall at Toyyar lake as the entire village has opposed for the said project of Unity Mall, it is unanimously resolved by the panchayat body not to issue the said permission and reject the said file on the basis of following technical grounds:-

1) The Toyyar Lake located in Survey No. 40/1 is a notified wetland as per Notification No. 11-2/GSWA/2021-22/Notification/601 dated 30/09/2021 issued by the Goa State Wetland Authority.
2) The Zone of Influence of the said Chimbel (Toyyar) Lake admeasuring 1,79,520.96 sq. mts. includes the properties surveyed under Survey No. 40/1 admeasuring 1,18,338.41 sq. mts.
3) As per the report and document prepared by CSIR-NIO and Goa State Biodiversity Board (GSBB), the zone of influence of the wetland is 26.31 hectares, and the same is available on the Goa State Wetland Authority website.
4) Construction activities are prohibited within the Zone of Influence as per the said notification and the Wetland (Conservation and Management) Rules, 2017.
5) In addition, there exists a mandatory buffer zone of 50 metres from the boundary of the wetland, within which no development is permitted.
6) The Goa State Biodiversity Board (GSBB) has not issued any permission or clearance for the said Unity Mall project.
7) The boundaries of the Zone of Influence and buffer zone have not been demarcated on the site, leading to further environmental ambiguity and risk.
8) In view of the above facts, it is evident that the proposed construction of the Unity Mall covering an area of approximately 25,000 sq. mts. falls within the Zone of Influence of the notified wetland "Toyyar Lake", and hence is not permissible under law.

Resolved unanimously.

Sarpanch
V.P. Chimbel, Tiswadi-Goa

Village Panchayat Chimbel Tiswadi - Goa

Secretary
V. P Chimbel, Tiswadi - Goa

C.P.C.

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
		Soft copy. ~~Applic~~ ~~appellant~~ intervenor me	
Govind Shirodkar		sought time to fixed the matter on 01/12/2025. as his council is busy with the court matter. AS-P.O. is busy with the 2 P. election. matter is adjourned for the written reply and arguments of the ~~Respondents~~ ~~and~~ intervenor, & no further opportunity will be given to the intervenor if reply is not filed on that date. matter is fixed for the reply and final argument on	26/11/2025 09.30 a.m

Certified Xerox Copy

Block Development Office
Tiswadi Panaji Goa

C. P. C.

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
27/11/2025		Matter called out today.	
04.30 A.m.		Adv. for the Intervenor.	
		Present. Adv. for the	
		Respondent Panchayat	
		Present file ~~~~ written.	
		Synopses on behalf of the	
		Panchayat / Respondent No. 1.	
		Brought on record copy of.	
		the same was handed over	
		to Adv. of the Parties.	
		Since the matter was.	
		kept for filing of Reply.	
		of the Respondent Panchayat	
		and oral arguments of	
		parties. Arguments advanced	
		by the Counsil of Respondent	
		Panchayat, Appellants Adv.	
		and the Intervenors Adv.	
		is heard.	
		I, have gone through	
		the Appeal memo of the	
		Appellant. Replies of all	
		the Parties and gone	
		through the correspondences	
		placed on record.	
		The Appellant has filed	
		this present Appeal invoking	
		Section 20 (A) of the T.P.	
		P.A. 1994. which provides	
		for an appeal to the	
		B.D.O. against the inaction	
		or refusal of a Panchayat	

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
		of its Secretary to perform their duties under the Act	
		Section 201-A. Appeal on Miscellaneous matter dealt by the Panchayat :- (1) where no appeal has been specifically provided in this Act. on any Miscellaneous matter which is dealt with by the Panchayat or the V.P. Secretary or the Sarpanch an appeal shall be to the B.D.O. within a period of thirty days from the date of Refusal of any request by the said authority and his decision on such appeal subject to the provision of Sub-Section (2) shall be final.	
		Explanation - For the purpose of this Section. "Refusal" means Rejecting of an request in writing or non-Conveying of any reply to the application within a Period of fifteen days from the receipt of application in his office. This authority has	

Govt. Ptg. Press, Panaji-Goa—S/30/50,000—09/2024.

C.P.C.

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
		has Jurisdiction to entertain and adjurate the matter under Section 201/(A) of the Act.	
		The Unity mall Project scheme for Special Assistance to State for Capital investment 2023-24. and Specialized Central Govt. Scheme, conceived for the Socio-economic benefit of State of Goa and its local population and is Partly financed by the Central Government.	
		However the Govt has carried out ammendment in various Provisions of GPR.A 1994. above is Rule 3. has been ammended and Provided "The Pachyat ~~on such date and at least four time in a~~ } [illegible]	
		Shall meet at least four time in a month on such date and at such time as may be fixed by The Sarpach or in his absence by The Dy. Sarpach.	
		This has been made so that the work of citizen do not get delayed.	

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
		hence the idea behind such ammendment is for ease of ~~B~~ doing business.	
		order on this application filed by the Appellant is passed.	
		In view of all the documents on record - and taking into consideration the arguments of parties.	
		The Appeal under section 201(CA) of the G.P.R.A. 1994 filed by the Appellant is allowed. The Rejection letter dated. 16/10/2025 issued by the V.P. Chimbel Tiswadi is quashed and set aside. The Panchayat is directed to issue Construction licence to the appellant within 24 hours from the date of receipt of this order.	
		Pronounced in open court No order as to cost Given under the seal of this office on this 27th day of November 2025.	
		Place: Panaji Date: 27/11/2025. Anil L. Dhumasker B.D.O. Tiswadi	
		Since the order is pronounced late ~~[illegible]~~ at 5.50 P.M	

Adv. for Intervenor R-2

27/11/2025 at 6.55 P

C. P. C.

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
		the Typo order copy. and entire Judgement will be Provided to all the Parties on tomorrow i.e. 28/11/2025 Second half of the day.	27/11/2025 at 7:11 pm
			27/11/2025 7:15 p.m

BEFORE THE BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICER - TISWADI AT PANAJI GOA

Appeal No.201(A)/11/2025-26

GOA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LTD.
Through the Authorized Signatory, having office at 3rd Floor, Paryatan Bhavan, Patto, Panaji, Goa

...APPELLANT

VS.

VILLAGE PANCHAYAT OF CHIMBEL
Through the Secretary,
Chimbel – Tiswadi,
Goa

...RESPONDENT

AND

GOVIND SHIRODKAR,
Son of late Tukaram Shirodkar
Age-63 years, resident of H.No. 133, Gaulem Bhat, Chimbel, Tiswadi – Goa

...INTERVENER

JUDGMENT

Heard Adv. A. Sardesai for the Appellant-GTDC; Adv. Dinesh Naik for Respondent-Panchayat; and Adv. M. Simoes for the Intervener.

Office of The Block Development Officer * Panaji-Goa 403 001 *

1. The present Appeal is filed by the Appellant under Sec.201-A of Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994, challenging the Impugned Order dated 16/10/2025 passed by the Respondent-Panchayat by which the grant of construction license to the Appellant for its Unity Mall project at Chimbel Village is rejected by the Panchayat.

2. It is the case of the Appellant that by letters dated 03/02/2023, 02/05/2023 and 16/06/2023, Department of Expenditure under the Ministry of Finance – Government of India circulated Guidelines / Supplementary Guidelines under the "Scheme for Special Assistance to States for Capital Investment 2023-24". In these guidelines the construction of Unity Malls is to be undertaken in various States of the country. As per the guidelines the main objective of the Scheme is to promote National Integration, promote concept of 'Make in India', promote concept of 'One District One Product' (ODOP), help rural artisans in selling their products, generate employment and increase marketability of quality indigenous products. The said guidelines have provided for allocation of Rs.100 Crores for the State of Goa for Unity Mall project and the amount

Office of The Block Development Officer
Ponda-Goa 403 401

over and above the same is to be borne by the State Government.

3. The Finance Department of Government of Goa forwarded the guidelines to various departments including the Department of Tourism requesting them to comply with the relevant part of the Scheme to avail the benefit thereof. Accordingly, the Appellant was authorized by the Department of Tourism to undertake development of the Unity Mall in Survey No. 40/1 of village Chimbel, Tiswadi–Goa. Appellant has produced Letter dated 15/03/2024 wherein it is stated that in XLIII Cabinet Meeting, approval was granted to transfer the project site specifically for development of Unity Mall and allied services; Appellant has further relied on the minutes of the Meeting held on 28.11.2024 of the Expenditure Finance Committee (EFC) wherein the construction of Unity Mall-Goa was deliberated upon in detail and the cost of Rs. 201.42 Crores was approved by the EFC out of which Rs. 100 Crores were sanctioned under the Central Government Scheme and the balance by the State Government.

Office of The Block Development Officer * Ponda-Goa 403 401 *

4. For development of the project, the Appellant has obtained a Recommendation of Goa State Wetlands Authority – Technical Committee dated 18/07/2025, Recommendation of Goa State Biodiversity Board dated 14/08/2025, Technical Clearance Order dated 21/08/2025 from TCP Department, Environmental Clearance dated 12/09/2025 from Goa State Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Tree Cutting Permission dated 23/09/2025 from Forest Department, NOC dated 07/10/2025 from Electricity Department, Consent to Establish dated 27/10/2025 from Goa State Pollution Control Board.

5. It is the case of the Appellant that all the concerned departments of the State and Central Government have approved the project, except for the Village Panchayat of Chimbel which has rejected the grant of Construction License.

6. Appellant has argued that the rejection which is based on both procedural and technical grounds is illegal, arbitrary, without jurisdiction, and issued in undue haste; that all objections raised are either incorrect, or already complied with. The technical objections are outside the statutory

Office of The Block Development Officer * Panaji-Goa 403 001 *

scope of the Panchayat. Appellant has also relied on letter dated 24/10/2025 issued by Goa State Wetland Authority wherein it is stated that proposed project falls beyond the buffer zone and zone of influence of Notified Toyyar Lake wetland area and therefore the same is not within the purview of GSWA.

7. On the issue of maintainability, the Appellant argued that the Appeal is maintainable under Sec. 201-A of the Act as there is no other provision which deals with rejection of construction license. It is argued that Sec.66(2) of the Act is applicable only when the Panchayat does not decide the application for construction license. Since there is no provision which deals with rejection of construction license, the appellant has come before this Authority under Sec. 201-A of the Act.

8. Respondent- Panchayat has filed a reply and opposed the Appeal. The case of the Respondent is that the Appellant has approached this Authority with suppression of material facts to misguide the Authority; that the Appellant has no lawful authority to file the Appeal or the Application before the Panchayat and that the Appellant has not

Office of the Block Development Officer * Panaji-Goa 403 001 *

produced any ownership document and that Form I & XIV is not a Title Document.

9. Respondent has argued that this Authority does not have jurisdiction to take up the present proceedings as the same should be filed before the Deputy Director under Sec. 66(2) of Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994.

10. It is argued by the Respondent that in the Gram Sabha held on 25/08/2024 it was unanimously resolved to strongly object to the Unity Mall proposed in Survey No. 40/1 of Chimbel as it is near Toyyar Lake. That the Panchayat has made representations to the Tourism Minister, Director of Tourism, TCP Minister, TCP Department etc. objecting to any construction activity near Toyyar Lake.

11. It is submitted that even though the TCP has issued permission the same is with terms and conditions which the Appellant failed to comply. The Panchayat received complaints regarding illegal development activities in Survey No. 40/1 and based on the same issued Stop Notice. That the Chairman of the Biodiversity Committee filed a complaint to the Police Station of Old Goa regarding

illegal works and the same was forwarded to the Panchayat seeking clarification. It was clarified by the Panchayat that no permission was granted for the illegal activity.

12. Panchayat has argued that Appellant failed to furnish documents so as to deal with the Application and secondly the Gram Sabha also had resolved to oppose the said construction.

13. The Intervener has also filed a reply supporting the impugned order of Panchayat and has opposed the Appeal. It is the case of the Intervener that there is a lack of critical infrastructure available in the village. That the combined water requirement of villages of Chimbel, St. Cruz and Merces is 14 MLD and the supply is 12 MLD resulting in deficit of 2 MLD. Intervener has relied on the Condition No. 3 of the Technical Clearance Order dated 21.08.2025, which states that the development permission will not entitle the Applicant for making / laying any claim on water connection from Government of Goa. Therefore, it is argued that unless provision for adequate water supply is made, no permission can be granted.

Office of The Block Development Officer
Panaji-Goa 403 001

14. It is further argued that village Panchayat is ill-equipped to manage garbage and solid waste. Therefore, additional waste from the Unity Mall shall pose serious environmental and public health concerns. That the village Panchayat of Chimbel is experiencing frequent and recurring power outages and low voltage which has resulted in damage to household appliances.

15. Intervener has further objected on the ground of ambiguity regarding the proposed project's location within a wetland area. The Respondent who is stated to be a member of Gram Sabha and the Chairperson of Biodiversity Management Committee and Lake Management Committee. Intervener has submitted that the Biodiversity Management Committee has submitted a representation to Goa State Wetland Authority challenging the accuracy of the Notification dated 30/09/2021. The said representation is stated to be based on the findings of Hydrological Survey Report prepared by Terra Hydrotech Solutions. According to the Intervener the portion of Survey No. 40/1 falls within the notified Wetland area. Furthermore, the Gram Sabha has resolved that the entire area falling outside the

Office of The Block Development Officer
Panaji-Goa 403 001

notified wetland boundary be declared as Biodiversity Park.

16. Further it is argued that Appellant does not have ownership, that the Intervener had also filed a complaint in pursuance of which stop notice was issued that the application for construction license was filed after the said stop work notice.

17. Upon considering the submissions and documents of the parties it can be seen that the Appellant had sought Construction License for undertaking construction of Unity Mall in the site specifically transferred to Department of Tourism for the purpose of construction of Unity Mall. The said approval was granted in the XLIII Meeting of Council of Ministers. The Appellant was specifically authorized by the Department of Tourism to develop Unity Mall. It is noted that all other departments have also granted permission to the Appellant for the said project. Therefore, the Appellant has the requisite authorisation to apply for construction license.

18. As far as applicability of wetland buffer zone is concerned, in the Minutes of Technical Committee of Meeting of

Office of The Block Development Officer
Panaji-Goa

GSWA it is noted that the project site 531 mts away from the nearest wetland. Also, by letter dated 24/10/2025, the GSWA has stated that the project falls beyond 50mts buffer zone and zone of influence and does not fall within the purview of GSWA. These documents establish that the project site is neither a wetland nor within the buffer of wetland. Therefore, the private report produced by the Intervener cannot be accepted when the expert government authority GSWA has clarified the project is beyond their purview.

19. Respondent has argued that the necessary documents are not furnished. The same cannot be a ground to reject the construction license. Instead, the Panchayat should have asked for copies of the said documents to consider the application. The Appellant has produced all the documents along with the Appeal which according to the Panchayat were not submitted. Therefore, it is clear that all the documents are duly obtained by the Appellant which have to be considered. The Panchayat on the other hand in its reply has not stated as to any specific document that is yet to be obtained. Also it is not said that documents

Office of The Block Development Officer

mentioned in the appeal are not adequate for grant of construction license.

20. Appellant has rightly submitted that furnishing of documents is procedural and should not result in rejection of the application in a haste. The Panchayat cannot reject applications outright when the applicant is a government department executing a government-approved project.

21. The Technical Grounds raised by Panchayat are beyond its jurisdiction. The Panchayat has cited reasons relating to pressure on natural resources, Threat to Toyyar Lake, Impact on biodiversity, Zone of Influence, etc. These are environmental, hydrological, and scientific matters. The Panchayat has no statutory authority, competence, or expertise to decide these issues. Environmental concerns must be addressed by GSPCB which has issued Consent to Establish; GSBB which has given its recommendations; GSWA which has clarified that the project is beyond its jurisdiction; the SEIAA which has given its Environmental Clearance; Forest Department which has given tree cutting permission; and health department has given its NOC. All these expert and competent bodies have already cleared the

project. Therefore, the Panchayats technical objections are illegal, without jurisdiction, and unsustainable.

22. As far as Conversion Sanad is concerned, in terms of the Building Regulations the same may be obtained at the time of Occupancy Certificate. The Appellant has argued that there is an exemption for government projects. This Authority is not deciding about the exemption. However non submission of conversion sanad cannot be a ground for rejecting construction license since it can be obtained before the occupancy certificate.

23. The Unity Mall Project is a national-level public infrastructure project. It is designed to Promote "One District One Product (ODOP)", Generate local employment, support rural artisans, promote national integration, Boost local economy. The Respondent has failed to consider that the land is Government-owned, the project is Government-approved, the funding is partly Central, all technical bodies have approved the project, the Unity Mall is for the benefit of local residents.

24. As far as interveners contention of electricity requirement is concerned, the electricity department has granted its

Office of The Block Development Officer * Panaji-Goa 403 001 *

NOC. There is some substance in the contention of the Intervener that water supply and waste management are issues of public importance. The said issues have to be dealt with by the Appellant prior to obtaining occupancy certificate so that the public is not adversely affected. However, the same cannot be a ground to reject construction of a government project which is approved by all the other authorities.

25. Accordingly, I pass the following order.

ORDER

In view of all the documents on record and taking into consideration the arguments of parties, the appeal under Sec.201-A of Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 is allowed. The rejection letter dated 16/10/2025 issued by Panchayat is quashed and set aside. The Panchayat is directed to issue construction license to the appellant within 24hrs from the receipt of this Order.

No order as to cost.

Pronounced in open court.

Office of The Block Development Officer * Panaji-Goa 403 001 *

Given under the seal of this Office on this 28th day of November, 2025.

Date:-28/11/2025

Place:-Panaji-Goa.

Office of The Block Development Officer * Panaji-Goa 403 001 *

(Anil L. Dhumaskar)
Block Development Officer
Tiswadi-Goa.

Jose

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.3112 OF 2025 (F)

GOVIND SHIRODKAR ... PETITIONER
Versus
GOA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION THR ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR AND ANR ... RESPONDENT

Mr. Om D'Costa, Advocate for the Petitioner.

CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

DATED :- 28th November, 2025

P.C.:

1. Considering the urgency in the matter, issue notice to the Respondents returnable at 3:45 p.m. today.

2. A private notice shall be served on Advocate Mr. Shivan Desai who appeared for the Respondent No.1 before the BDO. A private notice may also be given to the Counsel who appeared for the concerned Village Panchayat (Respondent No.2). A private notice by Email shall also be issued to both the Respondents.

3. The Registry to issue urgent notice on Email to the Respondents, considering the urgency in the matter. The Email ID of the Respondents shall be provided by the Petitioner.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

Meena

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.3112 OF 2025 (F)

GOVIND SHIRODKAR ... PETITIONER
Versus
GOA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION THR ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR AND ANR ... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Om D'Costa and Ms. Malisa Zemira Simoes, Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. Shivan Desai, Advocate for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Dinesh Naik, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

DATED :- 28th November, 2025

P.C.:

1. Affidavit in reply to be filed by the Respondent with an advance copy.

2. The learned Advocate for the Panchayat submits that there is a direction to the BDO in the impugned order that the Secretary of Village Panchayat shall issue a construction license within 24 hours. Learned Advocate appearing for the Respondent No.1 objects the stay of the impugned order submitting that the project is of public importance and has been long pending. It is also submitted that the

petitioner have efficacious alternate remedy of revision before the Deputy Director under the Panchayat Raj Act, 1994.

3. Considering the short time within which this petition was required to be heard and the fact that the Respondents, have both put in appearance at the request of the Court, this petition shall be heard on 01.12.2025, considering that the BDO has directed the Secretary to issue construction license within 24 hours, which ends today, the order of the BDO is insofar as these directions are concerned, shall be deferred until the next date of hearing.

4. List the matter on 01.12.2025.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

Signed by: MEENA VISHAL BHOIR
Designation: Private Secretary
Date: 28/11/2025 18:23:36

Jose

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.3112 OF 2025 (F)

GOVIND SHIRODKAR ... PETITIONER
Versus
GOA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION THR ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR AND ANR ... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Om D'Costa and Ms. Malisa Zemira Simoes, Advocates for the Petitioner.
Senior Advocate Mr. D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr. Shubham Priolkar, Additional Government Advocate, Mr. Shivan Desai (through V.C.) and Mr. Aniroodh Sardessai, Advocates for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Dinesh Naik with Ms. S. Arabekar, Advocates for Respondent No.2.

CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

DATED :- 1st December, 2025

P.C.:

1. The arguments have been partly heard.

2. List the matter on 04.12.2025 at 10:30 a.m.

3. The order dated 28.11.2025 shall continue till the next date of hearing.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

Signed by: JOSE FRANCISCO DSOUZA
Designation: Personal Assistant
Date: 01/12/2025 17:12:15

Suzana

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.471 OF 2025

GOVIND SHIRODKAR ... PETITIONER

Versus

GOA TOURISM DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION THR ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR AND ANR ... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Om D'Costa, Advocate with Ms Malisa Z. Simoes, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Senior Advocate Mr. Devidas J. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr. Shubham Priolkar, Additional Government Advocate, Mr. Shivan Desai, Mr. Aniroodh Sardessai and Ms Riya Amonkar, Advocates for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Dinesh Naik with Ms. Shruthi Arabekar, Advocates for Respondent No.2.

CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

DATED :- 4th December, 2025

P.C.

1. Registry to waive objections and register the matter.

2. Mr Dinesh Naik, learned Counsel for Respondent No.2, places on record a notice dated 02.12.2025 issued in Petition No.DDPN/Rev/Chimbel/Tis/05/2025/9198 filed by the Panchayat of Chimbel/Respondent No.2 in the present Petition before the Deputy Director of Panchayats North at Panaji, which is filed in challenge to the order dated 28.11.2025 impugned in this Petition. He submits that

the Petitioner herein has been arrayed as Respondent No.2 in the Panchayat proceedings before the Deputy Director of Panchayats North, and the same has been listed today at 04:00PM. He further submits that the Petitioner and the Respondent No.1 herein have been served by a notice of the Deputy Director of Panchayats North for the hearing listed today, i.e. on 04.12.2025.

3. In view of the notice issued by the Deputy Director of Panchayats on the revision filed before it, the learned Advocate, Mr Om D'Costa, appearing for the Petitioner, after taking instructions from the Petitioner who is present in Court, seeks leave to withdraw the present Petition and submits that he would appear before the Deputy Director of Panchayats North today and participate in the proceedings at 04:00PM.

In this view of the matter, the present Petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

Signed by: MARIA SUZANA REBELLO
Designation: Personal Assistant
Date: 04/12/2025 13:59:29

1/2

C. P. C.

PROCEEDINGS SHEET

The Court of the Dy. Director of Panchayats. North

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. Rev/05/2025 of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
		The Village Panchayat of Chimbel Through its Secretary, Having office at Panchayat Ghar Chimbel, Illhas, Goa —	Petitioner
		v/s	
		Complainant/Applicant/Appellant/Plaintiff	
		1) The Goa Tourism Dev. Corp., Through its authorised signatory, Having their office at Paryatan Bhavan, Patto, Panaji-Goa	
		2) Govind Shirodkar	
		Accused/Opponent/Respondent/Defendant	
		S/o Late Tukaram Shirodkar Indian National, age 63 years R/o H No. 133 Gaulam Bhat Chimbel, Tiswadi, Goa —	Respondents
		The above named Revision Petitioner has filed Revision Petition dtd. 02.12.2025 against the named Respondents interms of Section 201-A (2) of The Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994.	
		Issued Notices to both the parties & hearing is now fixed on 04.12.2025 at 4 pm in the chamber of the undersigned at 4th floor, Myles High Corporate Hub, Patto, Panaji, Goa	

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PANCHAYATS NORTH PANAJI ★ GOVT. OF GOA ★

2/2

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
04/12/25		Matter called out today. Adv. D. Naik for the Petitioner Adv A. Sardessai present for R1 and files vakalatnama. Adv. Om D'Costa for the R2 and undertakes to file Vakalatnama. Adv for Petitioner places on record the acknowledgment copy of the notices served. Replies and arguments filed before the Block Development officer Tiswadi already form a part of the annexures of the reply petition filed by the Petitioner herein. Adv for R2 submits they will be submitting their reply today itself with advance copies served to the other parties. By consent arguments on merits were heard. Arguments on merits heard from the parties. Adv for R2 also files a petition instead and both the petitions will be disposed by a common order since the matters it raises are concerning the same structure. Matter now fixed for orders.	05.12.2025 12 noon
		4/12/2025	
		The impugned order of the BDO is	Adv. For R.2

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PA ★ GOVT.

Govt. Ptg. Press, Panaji-Goa—S/40/50,000—6/2022.

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No. 05/2025 of 20	Date to which the case is adjourned
		deferred till next date of hearing i.e. 5/12/2025 at 2:00pm.	
		04/12.	CN 04/12/2025 at 6.10 p.m
05/12/2025		Matter called out today. Adv. S. Arabekar for the Petitioner Adv. A. Sardessai for Respondent No. 1. Adv. O.D'Costa for Respondent no. 2. Matter was fixed for orders. Based on the submissions on record and the arguments lead ~~said~~, the following order is passed in the present revision petition.	
		ORDER	
		The present petition is hereby dismissed.	
		Pronounced	
		Order on record.	
		Proceedings stand closed.	Arabekar Adv. for Petitioners
		05/12/2025	For R. 2 05/12/2025
		Adv for the ~~Petitioner~~ Respondent no. 2 filed an application for grant of stay of Judgment dated 05.12.2025, which is objected to by Resp no. 1 and not objected to by ~~for~~ the Petitioner. Since there	

MAMLATDAR OF HAYATS NORTH PANAJI GOA

4/2

C. P. C.

of 20

Date	No. of Exhibit	Case No.	Date to which the case is adjourned
		proceedings in the matter are already closed and in the absence of any specific provision of CPR Act 1994, granting this Authority to stay its own order, the ~~folio~~ applicatn cannot be allowed.	Adv. For R.2
		05/12/25	Adv for Petitioner
		Adv for Petitioner requests orally to give them a time of 7 days to ~~comply with the~~ consider the order of this Authority. The Adv for petitioner is once again informed that the present proceedings are under the jurisdiction of this Authority as a Revisional Court. and hence scope of consideration of matters only pertains to upholding the appeal order or setting it aside and hence since the order has been upheld, there arises no question of this Authority interfering with the directions of the Appellate authority.	For R.2
		05/12	Adv for Petitioner

DEPUTY ... OF PANCH ... GOVT. OF

CERTIFIED COPY

Copy applied on 05.12.2025

Copy ready for delivering on 05.12.2025

Copy delivered on 05.12.2025

Checked by

Copying fees Rs. 81/- (Rupees Eighty one Only)

Credited in Directorate of Panchayats Panaji

Receipt No. 203/215 Dated 05.12.2025

(Shilpa A. Mulgaonkar)
Su-Stenographer
O/o. Dy. Director of Panchayats (N)
Panaji-Goa

ATS NORTH PANAJI

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PANCHAYATS NORTH PANAJI
GOVT. OF GOA

BEFORE THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PANCHAYATS – NORTH AT PANAJI GOA.

Case No. DDPN/Rev/Chimbel/Tis/05/2025

The Village Panchayat of Chimbel,
Through its Secretary,
Having office at Panchayat Ghar, Chimbel,
Ilhas, Goa.
.....Petitioner

V/s

1. The Goa Tourism Development Corporation
   Through its authorised signatory,
   Having their office at Paryatan Bhavan,
   Patto, Panaji – Goa.

2. Govind Shirodkar,
   S/o late Tukaram Shirodkar,
   Indian National, age 63 years,
   R/o H. No. 133, Gaulem Bhat,
   Chimbel, Tiswadi – Goa

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PANCHAYATS NORTH PANAJI GOVT OF GOA

.....Respondents

WITH

Case No.DDPN/Rev/Chimbel/Tis/06/2025

Govind Shirodkar,
S/o late Tukaram Shirodkar,
Indian National, age 62 years,
R/o H. No. 133, Gaulem Bhat,
Chimbel, Tiswadi, Goa.
.....Applicant/Petitioner

V/s

1. The Goa Tourism Development Corporation
   Through its authorised signatory,
   Having their office at Paryatan Bhavan,
   Patto, Panaji – Goa.

2. The Village Panchayat of Chimbel, Through its Secretary, Having office at Panchayat Ghar, Chimbel, Ilhas, Goa.

..... **Respondents**

OF PANCHAYATS NORTH PANAJI GOVT. OF GOA

JUDGMENT

1. The present judgment and order shall dispose of the revision petitions filed by the petitioners under section 201-A (2) of The Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994, against the judgment and order passed by the Ld. Block Development Officer, Tiswadi in Appeal No. 201(A)/11/2025-26 dated 28/11/2025.

2. Subsequent to the institution of the revision petition, notices were sent to all the parties. All the parties have appeared before me.

3. For the sake of convenience, the numbering scheme used in Revision Application 05/2025 will be followed in this judgment to refer to the parties.

4. The Impugned Order concerns the letter bearing Ref. No. VP/CHIM/2025-2026/1677 dated 16/10/2025 whereby the grant of construction license to Respondent no. 1 herein was rejected by the Petitioner herein (the Panchayat). Respondent No 1 herein challenged the rejection before the Ld Block Development Officer under Section 201-A, who then directed the Panchayat to grant the Construction License within 24 hours vide the Impugned Order.

5. The advocate for the Petitioner requested that the matter be heard finally due to the urgency in the matter. The

advocates for the Respondents agreed to the same. As such the matter is heard finally with consent of all the parties. The replies and arguments filed by the parties before the Ld. Block Development Officer form a part of the annexures of the petition filed before this Authority and hence final oral arguments of the parties on merits were heard by consent.

6. The Advocate for the Petitioner submitted that the application filed by Respondent No. 1 before the Panchayat bearing Ref. No. W-449/PC/SPV(GTDC)/2025-26/1131 dated 06/10/2025 contained discrepancies in the documents enclosed and that the proposal for grant of construction licence had also faced objections in the Gram Sabha. It was argued that Respondent No. 1 failed to furnish any valid ownership document as required under Point No. 13 of the TCP Clearance bearing Ref. No. TIS/11091/CHI/TCP/2025/2026 dated 21/08/2025, having submitted only Form I and XIV, which are revenue records and do not establish ownership, and further did not produce the conversion sanad required under Point No. 31 of the said TCP clearance. On these grounds, Advocate stated that the Panchayat could not have lawfully processed the application and that the proceedings initiated under Section 201-A are not maintainable since matters relating to grant or refusal of a construction licence fall under Section 66, for which there is an appeal under Section 66(2) or 66(7) before the Director of Panchayats. It was also urged that although the statute provides a period of 30 days to file a revision, the Block Development Officer directed the Panchayat to issue the construction licence within 24 hours without even keeping a reasoned order ready, thereby acting in undue haste and without jurisdiction.

7. The Learned Advocate for the Respondent no. 2 argued that the present proceedings are without jurisdiction. That the rejection or grant of a construction licence is governed exclusively by Section 66 of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994, and therefore cannot be examined under Section 201-A. It was submitted that the impugned order fails to assign any reasoning on the maintainability of the proceedings under Section 201-A or to clarify why the matter does not fall within the appellate remedy prescribed under Section 66(7). The Advocate further pointed out that the circulated versions of Section 66(7) contain a typographical error rendering the phrase as "order of direction or notice," whereas the expression as published in Gazette No. 47, Series I dated 20/02/1997, reads "order or direction or notice," thereby reinforcing the argument that such matters must be addressed under Section 66(7). Attention was also invited to Condition No. 14 of the TCP Clearance order, which mandates the Panchayat to ensure infrastructure requirements such as water supply and garbage disposal before issuing the construction licence. It was argued that this statutory responsibility of the Panchayat has been overridden by the Block Development Officer in the concluding portion of the impugned order. The Advocate further placed reliance on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa in W.P. No. 116 of 2009 wherein at Para 9 it was held that matters stipulated by section 66 are not subject to provisions of section 201 – A.

8. The Advocate for Respondent No. 1 submitted that Section 66(2) of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 does not contemplate rejection of a construction licence, and therefore the Petitioner rightly invoked the Appellate jurisdiction under Section 201-A, particularly in view of the Explanation to Section 201-A which expressly includes

refusal" by a Panchayat. With regards the argument of absence of ownership documents, Advocate for Respondent No 1 submitted that Form I and XIV was duly placed on record and the entries therein reflect the names of Government departments, all of which are departments of the Government of Goa, thereby establishing the Government's lawful interest over the land. Advocate further referred to a communication issued by the Department of Information Technology bearing Ref. No. 4(81)2017-18/DOIT/IT Park at Chimbel/2116 dated 15/03/2024 to the Department of Tourism, conveying transfer of the land vested in DoIT to DoT for implementing the Unity Mall and allied activities and submitted that this clearly establishes the chain of authority. As regards the Gram Sabha objections, Advocate argued that a Gram Sabha resolution has no statutory bearing on the grant of a construction licence, which is a matter solely within the administrative prerogative of the Panchayat body, and that none of the representations made by the Village Panchayat before various authorities disclose any legally sustainable grounds. Reliance was placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa in Writ Petition No. 2695 of 2023 (F) which states the following at para 38, "*.....Therefore, appeal provided under sub-section 7 to the Director is only from any "order of direction or notice" issued under sub-section 3 or 4 of Section 66, and not otherwise.*" to counter the judgment cited by Advocate for Respondent No. 2. With respect to Condition No. 14 of the TCP clearance, Advocate pointed out that there is no material on record to show that the requisite infrastructure is not available within the jurisdiction of the Village Panchayat, and further contended that issues relating to wetlands fall outside the jurisdiction of the Goa State Wetland Authority in the present context as informed by them vide letter bearing Ref. No. 6-1/GSWA/2024-

2025/Issues/347 dated 26th August 2024, and that the project has already obtained approval from the TCP Department, Goa State Environment Impact Assessment Authority vide communication bearing No. 228/3/2025-26/GSEIAA/Project-Prop/143 dated 12/09/2025 and other authorities.

9. The Advocate for the Petitioner submitted that the construction plans placed on record pertain to an area of approximately 40,000 sq. mtrs., whereas the alleged transfer of land between Government departments pertains only to 25,000 sq. mtrs., thereby creating a discrepancy. The Advocate for Respondent no. 1 rebutted this by arguing that the total land as admeasured in Form I and XIV is over 4 lakh sq mts all belonging to the Government of Goa.

10. The Advocate for the Petitioner further argued that land cannot be transferred merely pursuant to a resolution of the Council of Ministers, and that any such transfer must strictly comply with the statutory procedure governing transfer of property. Advocate for the Petitioner also argued that the permissible FAR for the survey number in question is only 80. Respondent No. 2, supporting the Petitioner, submitted that the Panchayat's concerns regarding lack of infrastructure were specifically raised in its resolution rejecting the construction licence, and therefore cannot be said to be unsupported or extraneous. Advocate for Respondent No. 2 further argued that the judgment relied upon by Respondent No. 1 is per incuriam, being based on an incorrect version of Section 66(7).

11. On these points, Advocate for Respondent No. 1 submitted that the applicable FAR for the property is 200 as per Gazette Notification dated 11th January 2018 published in Series I No. 41. It was argued that the only remedy available against refusal of a license by a Panchayat is under Section 201-A, and therefore the revision is maintainable.

12. Under Section 201-A(2) of the Act, the revisional jurisdiction of this Authority is supervisory and limited to examining the legality, propriety, and regularity of the proceedings or order of the subordinate authority. Hence the following points arise for consideration:

(a) Whether the impugned order suffers from any irregularity, illegality, or impropriety warranting exercise of revisional powers under Section 201-A(2)?

(b) Whether any interference with the impugned order is called for?

REASONS AND FINDINGS

13. This Authority has gone through the records and proceedings, the Impugned Order, and the submissions of both sides. With respect to the argument of the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 that the present proceedings are not maintainable under Section 201-A of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994, this Authority finds no merit in the objection.

14. The reliance placed on Section 66(7) by the Petitioner and Respondent No 2 is misplaced. A complete reading of Section 66 makes it evident that "orders, directions and notices" issued thereunder pertain to enforcement measures arising upon detection of violations of law, such

as demolition, stoppage of work or compliance directions or grant of license. These provisions do not include a rejection of an application for construction license. Consequently, the objection to maintainability raised by the Petitioner as well as Respondent No. 2 is rejected.

15. Furthermore, the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa in the judgment of W.P. No. 2695 of 2023 (F), Pramod Parulekar vs. Village Panchayat of Socorro & Ors., has held that rejection of an application for permission to construct cannot be construed as an "order," "direction," or "notice" within the meaning of Section 66(7). The factual matrix in the said judgment is substantially similar to the present case, as it too involved a rejection of a construction licence application. In contrast, the decision in Laxman Naik Govekar vs. Village Panchayat of Merces relied upon by the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 does not aid their contention. The judgment in Laxman Naik Govekar vs. Village Panchayat of Merces pertains to a challenge of grant construction license by a third-party, and therefore falls in a distinct category. Similarly, W.P. No. 116 of 2009 concerns the revocation of a construction licence already issued, which is materially different from a refusal to grant one in the first instance. They thus operate in a different factual and statutory context and do not undermine the maintainability of the present petition under Section 201-A.

16. With respect to the contention of Respondent No. 2 that the judgment in Pramod Parulekar v. Village Panchayat of Socorro & Ors. is *per incuriam*, this Authority observes that any such declaration is within the exclusive domain of the Hon'ble High Court or a superior court. Accordingly, this Authority is bound by the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in Pramod Parulekar v. Village Panchayat of Socorro

& Ors., and this Authority has no choice but to uphold the Order of the BDO.

17. With regard to the contention of the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 that Respondent No. 1 failed to submit a conversion sanad, attention is invited to the first proviso to Section 30 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Land Revenue Code, 1968, which expressly provides that the requirement of obtaining permission for non-agricultural use shall not apply to land in the occupation of the Government. In the present matter, the record discloses that the land in question stands solely in the name of Government departments, as reflected in Form I & XIV, and is further supported by the communication of the Department of Information Technology transferring the land to the Department of Tourism. In view of the statutory exemption contained in the proviso to Section 30, the absence of a conversion sanad cannot, therefore, is not a defect in the application of Respondent No. 1.

18. With respect to the argument of objections from the Gram Sabha to the project, a Gram Sabha resolution has no statutory bearing on the grant of a construction licence, which is a matter solely within the administrative prerogative of the Panchayat body. The Hon'ble High Court in Meenakshi Financial Consultants (P) Ltd. v. Village Panchayat of Orlim (W.P. No. 116 of 2009) has held that no provisions in the Goa Panchayat Raj Act gives the Gram Sabha any power to object, revoke or reject any developmental permission. It is pertinent to note that the project is a Central Government Project which has to be completed in a timely manner. The project cannot be stopped at the behest of a Gram Sabha which does not have any statutory power to do so.

19. With respect to the argument of the Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 that Respondent No. 1 failed to submit any document proving ownership, it is pertinent to note that Section 14 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Land Revenue Code, 1968 categorically declares that all land which is not the property of any person shall be deemed to be the property of the Government, subject only to existing public and individual rights. In the present matter, the revenue records (Form I & XIV) reflect the names of Government departments as occupants of the land, and no contrary private title has been placed on record. The Government cannot be called upon to prove negative ownership, as land which is not vested in any private person stands statutorily vested in the Government by virtue of Section 14. In view of this statutory declaration, read in conjunction with the presumption of correctness of revenue entries under Section 96 of the Land Revenue Code, the absence of any document or conversion sanad does not undermine the Government's title to the land in question.

20. As regards the contention that the statutory procedure for transfer of property between Government departments has not been followed, it is to be noted that such an argument is misconceived. Under the scheme of Government ownership, the land ultimately vests in a single authority, namely, the Government of Goa. The Government constitutes a single entity, and its various departments function merely as instrumentalities established for the effective and convenient discharge of administrative responsibilities. What occurs between departments is not a transfer of property in the legal sense, but merely an administrative allocation of use, custody, and management based on functional requirements and administrative convenience.

Such inter-departmental reallocations do not amount to a "transfer of property" attracting the statutory provisions applicable to transfers between distinct legal entities. The underlying title continues to vest in the Government itself, and therefore the absence of a separate transfer instrument between departments does not create any defect in Government ownership or in the application submitted by Respondent No. 1.

21. As far as the objections of a technical nature concerning the adequacy of water supply and garbage-management infrastructure are concerned, it is observed that the Panchayat has not substantiated these objections with any supporting material or evidence. No technical report, site inspection record, correspondence with competent authorities, or documentary proof demonstrating insufficiency of infrastructure has been placed on record. In the absence of such substantiation, these objections remain uncorroborated assertions. It must also be noted that the project abuts the main road. That there are development projects on either side of the proposed site and the project does not come under the buffer zone of the Toyyar Lake as stated in the letter dated 24/10/2025 issued by the Goa State Wetland Authority.

22. The Judgment and Order of the Block Development Officer further records that Respondent No. 1 has obtained the requisite permissions from the concerned Government authorities. Since the present proceedings are in the nature of a revision under Section 201-A, the scope of scrutiny is limited to examining the legality, propriety and correctness of the Impugned Order. Accordingly, no interference is warranted on this ground.

23. As far as the contention that the Ld. BDO passed the order in undue haste by directing issuance of the licence within 24 hours is concerned, the Petitioner argues that this has resulted in the denial of a statutory right to file a revision within 30 days. This objection is misplaced. The Act does not stipulate that an order can be given effect to only after expiry of the limitation period for filing a revision, nor does it create any automatic embargo on implementation during such period. It is always open to an aggrieved party to approach the competent authority and seek an appropriate stay or interim protection. The mere fact that the order is implemented expeditiously does not, by itself, vitiate the order or amount to a violation of statutory rights. Accordingly, this objection is also not tenable.

24. In view of the above, this Authority deems it appropriate to pass the following order:

ORDER

The Revision Application is hereby dismissed.

The impugned order dated 28/11/2025 passed by the Ld. Block Development Officer Tiswadi in Appeal No. 201(A)/11/2025-26 is hereby confirmed. No interference is warranted under Section 201-A(2) of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994.

Pronounced.

Proceedings stand closed.

Given under my hand and the seal of this Authority on the **5th day of December 2025.**

(SANJANA BANDEKAR)
Deputy Director of Panchayats – North
Panaji – Goa

CERTIFIED COPY
Copy applied on 05.12.2025
Copy ready for delivering on 05.12.2025
Copy delivered on 05.12.2025
Checked by
Copying fees Rs 6.00 (Rupees Sixty five only)
Credited in Directorate of Panchayats Panaji
Receipt No 204/25 Dated 05.12.25
(Shilpa A. Mulgaonkar)
Sr Stenographer
O/o. Dy. Director of Panchayats (N)
Panaji-Goa

GANG010028882025

Civil Revision Application No.89/2025

O R D E R (below Exh.1)

(Delivered on this 6th day of the month of December of the year 2025).

1. Heard Ld. Advocate Ms. Simoes. She submitted that the complaint in the present case was filed on 22/9/2025 in respect of illegal construction carried out in survey no.40/1 of village Chimbel.

2. Show cause notice came to be issued on 1/10/2025. The respondent no.1 which is a corporation filed reply in the form of an application for construction licence dated 6/10/2025. The said application was rejected on 16/10/2025, against which the respondent no.1 preferred an appeal before the BDO under section 201-A of the Panchayat Raj Act on 30/10/2025. On 27/11/2025, the appeal was allowed by the BDO and the applicant came to be served on 28/11/2025. But, against the Order passed by

North Court Courts

the BDO, Writ Petition was preferred by the present applicant before the Hon'ble High Court, however, it came to be withdrawn on 4/12/2025.

3. In the meantime, Panchayat preferred revision before the BDO, thereafter applicant preferred revision before the Dy. Director of Panchayat on 4/12/2025. Arguments were heard on the same day and order came to be passed on 5/12/2025 in the afternoon session.

4. Ld. Advocate Simoes submitted that the impugned Order is bad in law, because as the BDO did not have jurisdiction to hear the appeal under section 201-A of the Panchayat Raj Act, appeal if any, ought to have been preferred before the Dy. Director of Panchyat u/s 66(7) of the Panchayat Raj Act.

5. Since the jurisdiction issue is raised by Ld. Advocate Ms. Simoes, I am of the considered opinion that the impugned Order is required to be stayed and opportunity will have to be given to the applicant to present their case.

6. In view of the above, I pass the following Order:-

North Goa Courts

O R D E R

The ad-interim relief is granted to the applicant to the extent of staying the execution and operation of the Order dated 5/12/2025 passed by the Dy. Director of Panchayat and consequently the Order of the BDO passed on 28/11/2025.

Merces.
Dated : 6/12/2025

IRSHAD ASHRAF AGHA
Digitally signed by IRSHAD ASHRAF AGHA
Date: 2025.12.06 19:55:22 +0530

(**Irshad Agha**)
Principal District Judge,
Merces

Sf*

North Court Courts

Case Status : Search by Case Number

Case Number | FIR Number | Party Name | Advocate Name | Case Code | Act | Case Type

Back

District and Sessions Court, Panaji

In The Court Of : Principal District Judge and Sessions Judge, North Goa

CNR Number : GANG010028882025

Case Number : CRVA/0000089/2025

Date : 06-12-2025

Mr. Govind Shirodkar **Versus** The Goa Tourism Development Corporation

Daily Status

Business	Next Purpose	Next Hearing Date

Called out Today. Adv Ms M. Simoes present for the Applicant files D/7 Appln to bring Addl. Documents on record. Arguments heard on Exh B/1- Ad-interim relief granted to the applicant. Issue notice to the respondents r/o 17.12.2025 at 2.30 p.m. In the evening sessions Adv Shivan Dessai appeared at 3.00 p.m. He could not mention as other matters were going on. Adv. Shivan Dessai places on record the construction licence at around 6.00 p.m. Immediately the other side Ld. Adv Ms Simoes was contacted and she was available only at 7.10 p.m. Adv Dessai submitted that he had filed caveat Appln. yesterday and same is at Exh D/4 Colly. Ld Adv Simoes submitted that Applicant nor she has received any caveat Appln. Ld Adv Shivan Dessai submits that caveat Appln has been forwarded by post in accordance with the Rules prescribed. Ld Adv Simoes raised the objection for taking any document on record. The xerox copy of the construction licence produced by Ld Adv Shivan Dessai is very important document. Hence objection raised by Ld Adv Simoes are overruled and xerox copy of construction licence is ordered to be filed.	APPEARANCE	17-12-2025

Print

Back

OFFICE OF THE VILLAGE PANCHAYAT
CHIMBEL TISWADI - GOA.

☎ : 2449790

Project Cell
Special Purpose Vehicle
(GTDC)
Panaji-Goa
Inward No. 4041
Date: 06/12/25

Ref. No. VP/CHIM/2025-2026/CONST/LIC/04/2007 Date: 06/12/2025

CONSTRUCTION LICENSE

Ref. No. 1) Appeal No. 201(A)/11/2025-26 before the Block Dvlpt Officer, Tiswadi Panaji Goa.
2)WRIT PETITION No. 3112 of 2025 (F) before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa.
3) Case No. DDPN/Rev/Chimbel/Tis/05/2025 before the Deputy Director of Panchayats-North at Panaji Goa.

License is hereby granted to you in terms of 47-B of GPRA 1994 in pursuance of judgement and order dated 28/11/2025 in appeal no. 201(A)/11/2025-26 issued by the Block Development Officer, Tiswadi Panaji Goa and judgement and order dated 05/12/2025 in Case no. DDPN/Rev/Chimbel/TIS/05/2025 issued by the Deputy Director of Panchayats-North at Panaji Goa, for carrying out the:-

(a) Proposed Construction of Unity mall in property Survey No. 40/1 at Village Chimbel.

(b) Subject to the following conditions:-

1. The applicant shall notify the Panchayat for giving the alignment of the building

2. The construction should maintain the minimum prescribed horizontal and vertical clearances from any overhead electrical line passing adjacent to the construction.

3. All RCC/Structural works shall be designed and supervised by the Engineer who has signed the Structural Liability Certificate submitted to the Panchayat.

4. No material for construction or earth from excavation or any other construction materials shall be stacked on the public road.

5. The Building should not be occupied unless the occupancy certificate is obtained from the Panchayat.

6. The construction license shall be revoked if the construction work is not executed as per the approved plans and the statements therein and whenever there is any false statement or misrepresentation of any materials passed, approved or shown in the application on which the permit was based.

7. The applicant should construct a separate soak pit in order to derivate in the sullage water.

8. Any soak pit should be constructed at a minimum distance of 15 meters away from any well.

9. The ventilation pipe of the septic tank should be provided with a mosquito net.

10. The applicant should connect the pipelines from their latrines/WC's to the sewerage line at their own cost, when the sewerage line is commissioned.

Village Panchyat Chimbel Tiswadi - Goa

11. The applicant should fix a board at a prominent place whenever the construction is started, including the number, the date and the authority for which the license for development work has been granted.

12. All the building material and other rubbish should be cleared from the construction site before applying for the occupancy certificate.

13. Water storage tanks shall be provided with mosquito proof lids and over flow pipes. The tanks should be provided with access ladders wherever necessary,

14. The drains surrounding the plot if any should be constructed with RCC and should be covered with removable RCC slabs of sufficient thickness.

15. The applicant should gift the road widening area to the Village Panchayat before applying for the occupancy certificate, if the applicant has utilized the extra FAR in lieu of the road widening affecting the plot.

16. The applicant should plaster and paint the building internally as well as externally before applying for occupancy certificate. Exposed bricks/laterite/concrete/stone/ashlars masonry finish to building will also be permitted.

17. The applicant should provide a dustbin at a convenient place accessible for the Municipal vehicle for collection of garbage.

18. Road widening area shall be asphalted to the existing road level before applying for occupancy certificate.

19. Garbage and parking areas shown in the approved plan shall be strictly used for parking purposes only and should be easily accessible to vehicles. No commercial activities shall be allowed in these areas.

20. Access up to the entrance of the Building is to be paved and is provided with drainage facilities.

21. Space for parking of vehicles is clearly demarcated on the ground.

22. No Restaurant/Bars will be permitted in the shops unless a separate soak pit is provided besides confirming to the rules in force.

23. No commercial activities will be permitted in the shops unless a separate permission is obtained from this Panchayat.

24. All temporary sheds/existing building shown to be demolished in the plan are demolished before applying of Occupancy Certificate.

25. Fire Escape staircases, if applicable shall be constructed as indicated in the approved plans.

.....2

26. All internal courtyards should be provided with drainage outlet.

27. The applicant should maintain all existing natural drains in the plot and should not block them at any stage.

28. No soak pit or other structures should come in the road widening area.

29. The plot boundary should be cordoned off by continuous sheet fencing either of wood or metal during the construction period.

30. The construction of compound wall should not obstruct any pathway or any public access. The applicant shall make necessary arrangements for smooth flow of rain water by keeping adequate opening in the compound wall for the purpose.

31.Storage of water should be done in such a way that mosquito breeding doesn't take place either by introducing fish in the tanks/wells or properly covering the iron drums/plastic tanks etc. or by observing dry day once a week.

32. Overhead tanks /sumps are provided with mosquito proof lids and other pipe fittings without any hole for the entry of mosquitoes. Outlet is to be covered by muslin /wire mesh. Ladder for inspection of the tank to be installed if required.

33. Curing water collections should be treated with anti-Larval chemicals by the builders/contractors.

34. Not to engage labourers for any construction/building work unless they are screened for malaria and posses health cards. These cards are to b e renewed regularly every 03 month. Also arrangement should be done to get their blood tested immediately in case of fever and ensure that full treatment is taken in consultation with NVBDCP programmed.

35. Laborers' to be provided with basic amenities like proper shelter, water for drinking and domestic proposes, proper sanitary conditions including toilet facilities.

36. To fill the pits, ditches water pools etc to avoid stagnation and to ensure no mosquito breeding site in and around especially in unused item like tyres, bottles, tins etc.

37. Drains/ Nallahs to be maintained clean around the site so that there is no blockage to flow of water. The gradient should be proper for drainage/flow and also proper cleaning of water should be done.

38. The Health units at the respective levels should be involved in the planning process.

39. No. gates shall open outward on to road.

40. The construction of the compound wall should be as per the approved plan. The applicant shall inform this Panchayat after the completion of the compound wall.

41. Drinking water well should be 15 meters away from any soak pit.

42. All the conditions stipulated in the Town and country Planning Department Tiswadi Panaji Goa Technical clearance order bearing **Ref. No. TIS/11091/CHI/TCP/2025/2026 dt. 21/08/2025** should be strictly followed.

43. All the conditions stipulated for in the Directorate of Health Services Primary Health Centre, Chimbel Goa.

.....3

44. The Waste generated during the Course Construction/repair renovation etc. shall be disposed off by the applicant/s in a scientific manner without harming the environment in its own property.

45. The NOC of The Health to be obtained by the applicant.

46. Proposed Construction of Unity Mall in property survey No. 40/1 at Village Chimbel.

47. The debris should not be dumped on road side.

48 The contact should be made to A.E (NH) to dispose debris as per notification No. 5-1-PCE-PWD-EO/2018/181 issued by P.C.E, P.W.D.

49. If any information is found to be false at any stage, or if the conditions stated herein above are not complied with, the Permission issued shall be liable to be withdrawn without pre-judice, to the legal Permission issued shall be liable to be withdrawn without pre-judice to the legal action that may be taken against the applicant.

THIS LICENSE IS VALID FOR A PERIOD OF THREE YEARS FROM THE DATE OF ISSUE OF THIS LICENCE, RENEWAL IF REQUIRED SHALL BE APPLIED WITHIN THE PERIOD OF THE VALIDITY OF THE LICENCE, HE/SHE HAS PAID THE LICENCE FEES TO THE TUNE OF RUPEES Rs. 100,86,280 /- (One Crore Eighty Six Thousand Two Hundred Eighty Only) VIDE RECEIPT No.682/32 DATED 6/12/25 AND LABOUR CESS Rs. Nil VIDE RECEIPT No. Nil DATED Nil

This carries the embossed seal of Panchayat Office of Village Panchayat Chimbel.

Village Panchayat Chimbel Tiswadi - Goa

(Shri. Hanumant S. Borkar)
Secretary
Village Panchayat Chimbel, Tiswadi-Goa

To,
The Executive Engineer (Civil),
Project Cell Department of Tourism
Goa Tourism Development Corporation (GTDC),
3rd Floor Paryatan bhavan, Patto,
Panaji Goa.

सत्यमेव जयते
जिल्हा आणि सत्र न्यायालय, उत्तर गोवा
District & Sessions Court, North Goa
e-Courts Mission Mode Project
Digital India Power To Empower

Home About Court Supreme Court High Court Services India Code Documents Notices

Home › Services › Case Status › Case Status : Search by Case Number

Case Status : Search by Case Number

Case Number | FIR Number | Party Name | Advocate Name | Case Code | Act | Case Type

Back

District and Sessions Court, Panaji

In The Court Of : Principal District Judge and Sessions Judge, North Goa

CNR Number : GANG010028882025

Case Number : CRVA/0000089/2025

Date : 17-12-2025

Mr. Govind Shirodkar **Versus** The Goa Tourism Development Corporation

Daily Status

Business	Next Purpose	Next Hearing Date

Called out Today. Adv Ms. M. Simoes present for the Applicant. Notice issued to R-1 and 2 duly served. Adv. A. Sardessai present in person along with Adv. S.Dessai through VC for respondent no. 1 Adv. Mr. D.Naik present for respondent no. 2. Files Wakalatnama on behalf of respondent no.2 . Adv. for applicant files application to amend Civil revision application no. 89/25 copy received by other side Op File. Adv. for respondent no. 1 files preliminary reply on behalf of the respondent no. 1 to the the stay application. Op File. Case adj. for reply and arguments of respondents on Exh. D-10 at 2.30pm	REPLY	08-01-2026

Print

Back

Feedback / Website Policies / Contact Us / Help / Disclaimer

Content Owned by District & Sessions Court, North Goa

Developed and hosted by National Informatics Centre,

Ministry of Electronics & Information Technology, Government of India

Last Updated: **Dec 20, 2025**